arXiv:1409.1968v1 [math.FA] 6 Sep 2014

THE PROOF OF THREE POWER-EXPONENTIAL INEQUALITIES

ANÍBAL CORONEL† AND FERNANDO HUANCAS†

Abstract. In this paper we prove three power-exponential inequalities for positive real numbers. In particular, we conclude that this proofs give affirmatively answers to three, until now, open problems (conjectures 4.4, 2.1 and 2.2) posed by Cîrtoaje in the following two works: "*J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.* 10, Article 21, 2009" and "*J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl.* 4:2:130-137, 2011". Moreover, we present a new proof of the inequality $a^{ra}+b^{rb}\geq a^{rb}+b^{ra}$ for all positive real numbers a and b and $r\in[0,e]$. In addition, three new conjectures are presented.

1. Introduction

The power-exponential functions have useful applications in mathematical analysis and in other theories like Statistics [1], Biology [2, 3], Optimization [4], Ordinary Differential equations [5] and Probability [6]. In the recent years there is a intensive research in this area, see for instance [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17] and the recent overview on general mathematical inequalities done by Cerone and Dragomir [18]. Some problems look like very simple but, are difficult to solve. For instance, we have the following two classical problems: find the solution of the equation $ze^z=a$ and the basic problem of comparing a^b and b^a for all positive real numbers a and b. The first problem is perhaps one of the most ancient and useful problems concerning to power-exponential functions, see for instance [19, 20, 21]. It was introduced by Lambert in [22] and have been studied by recognized mathematicians like Euler, Pólya, Szegö and Knuth, see [23, 24, 25]. The solution to the problem have been inspirited the definition of the well-known W-Lambert function, see [26]. For the solution to the second problem, see the discussion given in [27, 28] and more recently in [16]. Moreover, in spite of its algebraic simplicity, booth problems are the central topic of a large number of research papers in the last years (see [7, 11, 13] and references therein). In particular, in this paper, we are interested in some inequalities conjectured by Cîrtoaje in [12, 29], which are very close to the second problem. To be more specific, we start by recalling that in [30] was introduced and probed the following assertion: the inequality $a^a+b^b\geq a^b+b^a$ holds for all positive real numbers less than or equal to 1. After that, Cîrtoaje [12] introduce, prove and conjecture several results about inequalities for power-exponential functions. In particular, in [12], was established that the inequality

$$a^{ra}+b^{rb}\geq a^{rb}+b^{ra}, \tag{1.1}$$

holds true for $r\in[0,e]$ and for either $a\geq b\geq 1/e$ or $1/e\geq a\geq b>0$. However, in [12], Cîrtoaje leaves as an open problem the proof of (1.1) for $1>a>1/e>b>0$. Moreover, in [12] the following conjectures were introduced

Conjecture 4.3. If a,b,c are positive real numbers, then $a^{2a}+b^{2b}+c^{2c}\geq a^{2b}+b^{2c}+c^{2a}$.

Conjecture 4.4. Let r be a positive real number. The inequality

$$a^{ra}+b^{rb}+c^{rc}\geq a^{rb}+b^{rc}+c^{ra}, \tag{1.2}$$

holds true for all positive real numbers a,b,c with $a\leq b\leq c$ if and only if $r\leq e$.

Conjecture 4.6. Let r be a positive real number. The inequality $a^{ra}+b^{ra}\geq 2$ holds for all nonnegative real numbers a and b if and only if $r\leq 3$.

Date: September 9, 2014.

Key words and phrases. power inequalities, exponential inequalities, power-exponential inequalities.

† GMA, Departamento de Ciencias Básicas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Campus Fernando May, Chillán, Chile, E-mail: acoronel@ubiobio.cl, fihuanca@gmail.com.

Conjecture 4.7. If a and b are nonnegative real numbers such that $a+b=2$, then $a^{3b}+b^{3a}+2^{-4}(a-b)^4\geq 2$.

Conjecture 4.8. If a and b are nonnegative real numbers such that $a+b=1$, then $a^{2b}+b^{2a}\leq 1$.

Afterwards, the analysis of (1.1) was completed by Manyama in [14]. Thereafter, of the Cîrtoaje conjectures, the milestones of the history are the works of Coronel and Huancas [13], Matejíčka [31], Yin-Li [9] and Hisasue[10] (see also the work of Cîrtoaje [29]), where they proved the conjectures 4.3, 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8, respectively. Here, we should be comment that the proof of conjecture 4.4 is still open. Subsequently, in 2011 Cîrtoaje introduce a new proof of (1.1) and present the following three new conjectures

Conjecture 2.1. If $a,b\in]0,1]$ and $r\in]0,e]$, then $2\sqrt{a^{ra}b^{rb}}\geq a^{rb}+b^{ra}$.

Conjecture 2.2. If $a,b,c\in]0,1]$, then $3a^ab^bc^c\geq (abc)^a+(abc)^b+(abc)^c$.

Conjecture 5.1. If a,b are nonnegative real numbers satisfying $a+b=1$. If $k\geq 1$, then $a^{(2b)^k}+b^{(2a)^k}\leq 1$.

Recently, Miyagi and Nishizawa [7] has been proved the Conjecture 5.1. However, the conjectures 2.1 and 2.2 are still open. Thus, the main focus of this paper are the proofs of conjectures 4.4, 2.1 and 2.2.

The main contribution of the present paper is the development of the proof of the following three theorems:

Theorem 1.1. *The inequality* (1.1) *holds, for all positive real numbers a,b and for all $r\in[0,e]$.*

Theorem 1.2. *The inequality* (1.2) *holds, for all positive real numbers a,b,c and for all $r\in[0,e]$.*

Theorem 1.3. *The inequality*

$$2\sqrt{a^{ra}b^{rb}}\geq a^{rb}+b^{ra} \tag{1.3}$$

holds, for all positive real numbers a,b and for all $r\in[0,e]$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and $x_i\in]0,1]^n$. Then, the inequality*

$$n\prod_{i=1}^{n}x_i^{x_i}\geq\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{n}x_j\Big)^{x_i} \tag{1.4}$$

holds.

Note that the conjectures 4.4, 2.1 and 2.2 are solved by the Theorems 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, respectively. Moreover, we develop a proof of Theorem 1.1 which is an alternative proof of (1.1) for all positive real numbers a, b and $r\in[0,e]$, which is distinct to the existing proofs given in [14, 29].

The rest of the paper is organized in two sections: In section 2 we present the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 and in section 3 we present some remarks and three new conjectures.

2. Proofs of main results

In this section we present the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4. Firstly, we recall a result of [13]. Then, we present the corresponding proofs.

2.1. **A preliminar result.**

For completeness and self-contained structure of the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we need the following result of [13].

Proposition 2.1. *Consider $s\in\mathbb{R}^+$ with $s\neq 1$, $m\in\mathbb{R}^+$ and $f,g:\mathbb{R}^+\to\mathbb{R}$ defined as follows*

$$f(t)=t^s-t-\gamma^s+\gamma,\quad \text{and}\quad g(t)=\begin{cases}e^{-\ln(t)/(t-1)}, & t\notin\{0,1\},\\ e^{-1}, & t=1,\\ 0, & t=0.\end{cases}$$

Then, the following properties are satisfied

(i) $f(\gamma)=0$ *and* $f(0)=f(1)=-\gamma^s+\gamma$.

(ii) If $s>1$, f *is strictly increasing on* $]g(s),\infty[$ *and strictly decreasing on* $]0,g(s)[$.

(iii) If $s\in]0,1[$, f *is strictly decreasing on* $]g(s),\infty[$ *and strictly increasing on* $]0,g(s)[$.

(iv) g is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ and strictly increasing on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Furthermore $y = 1$ is a horizontal asymptote of $y = g(t)$.

2.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Without loss of generality, we assume that $a > b$. Indeed, we follow the proof (1.1) by application of Proposition 2.1 with $t = a^{rb}, \gamma = b^{rb}$ and $s = a/b$. Indeed, we distinguish three cases

(a_2) **Case** $a > b > 1$ $\Big(t > \gamma > 1$ and $s > 1\Big)$. By Proposition 2.1-(iv), we note that $g(s) < 1$. Then, by the strictly increasing behavior of f (Proposition 2.1-(ii)) we deduce the inequality since:

$$t > \gamma > 1 > g(s), \quad s > 1 \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad f(t) = a^{ra} - a^{rb} - b^{ra} + b^{rb} > f(\gamma) = 0.$$

(b_2) **Case** $a > 1 \geq b$ $\Big(t > 1 \geq \gamma$ and $s > 1\Big)$. For $\gamma \in [g(s), 1]$, we follow the inequality by almost identical arguments to that used before in (i), since $t > 1 \geq \gamma \geq g(s)$ and $s > 1$. Otherwise, if $\gamma \in [0, g(s)]$, we deduce that

$$f(t) = a^{ra} - a^{rb} - b^{ra} + b^{rb} > f(1) = f(0) > f(\gamma) = 0,$$

which implies the desired inequality.

(c_2) **Case** $1 > a > b > 0$ $\Big(1 > t > \gamma > 0$ and $s > 1\Big)$. First, we define $h : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ by the correspondence rule $h(t) = -rt \ln t$ for $t > 0$ and $h(0) = 0$. The function h is concave and has a maximum at $(1/e, r/e)$. Thus, we deduce that

$$-rb \ln b < 1, \quad \text{for all } b \in [0, 1] \text{ and } r \in [0, e]. \tag{2.1}$$

Secondary, by the Napier's inequality [32]:

$$0 < b < a \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \frac{1}{a} < \frac{\ln a - \ln b}{a - b} < \frac{1}{b}. \tag{2.2}$$

From (2.1) and (2.2) we have that

$$-rb \ln b \leq 1 \leq \frac{1}{a} < \frac{\ln a - \ln b}{a - b},$$

which implies $\gamma > g(s)$. The proof of this case is completed by application of Proposition 2.1-(ii).

Hence, by (a_2), (b_2) and (c_2) we follow that Theorem 1.1 is valid.

2.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** The proof of this theorem is again developed by application of Proposition 2.1. Firstly, we recall the notation of [13]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{R}^3_+ &= \{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \quad / \quad a > 0, \quad b > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c > 0\} \\
\mathbb{E}_1 &= \Big\{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \quad / \quad a = b = c \text{ or } a = b \neq c \text{ or } a \neq b = c \Big\}, \\
\mathbb{E}^+_a &= \Big\{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \quad / \quad a \geq 1 \text{ and } a > \max\{b, c\} \Big\}, \\
\mathbb{E}^-_a &= \Big\{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \quad / \quad 1 > a > \max\{b, c\} \Big\}, \\
\mathbb{E}^+_b &= \Big\{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \quad / \quad b \geq 1 \text{ and } b > \max\{a, c\} \Big\}, \\
\mathbb{E}^-_b &= \Big\{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \quad / \quad 1 > b > \max\{a, c\} \Big\}, \\
\mathbb{E}^+_c &= \Big\{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \quad / \quad c \geq 1 \text{ and } c > \max\{a, b\} \Big\} \quad \text{and} \\
\mathbb{E}^-_c &= \Big\{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \quad / \quad 1 > c > \max\{a, b\} \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The family $\Big\{\mathbb{E}_1, \mathbb{E}^+_a, \mathbb{E}^-_a, \mathbb{E}^+_b, \mathbb{E}^-_b, \mathbb{E}^+_c, \mathbb{E}^-_c\Big\}$ is a set partition of $\mathbb{R}^3_+$. Now, with this notation, we subdivide the proof in three parts:

(a_3) **Case** $(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{E}_1$. This special case is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.1.

(b_3) **Case** $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_a^+ \cup \mathbb{E}_b^+ \cup \mathbb{E}_c^+$. If $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_a^+$, we apply the Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 2.1 as follows. We select $t = a^{rb}, \gamma = c^{rb}$ and $s = a/b$, the monotonic behavior and properties of function f, defined on Proposition 2.1, implies that

$$a^{ra} + c^{rb} > a^{rb} + c^{ra}, \tag{2.3}$$

since $t > \gamma$, $t > 1$ and $s > 1$. Indeed, the corresponding proof of (2.3) needs the distinction of two cases: $c \geq 1$ and $c < 1$. If $c \geq 1$, then $\gamma > 1$ and $\gamma \in]g(s), \infty[$, so f is strictly increasing and $t > \gamma$ implies (2.3). For $c < 1$, we note that $\gamma < 1$ and $-\gamma^s + \gamma \geq 0$ since $s > 1$ and $1 \in]g(s), \infty[$, then the assumption $t > 1$ implies that $f(t) > f(1) = -\gamma^s + \gamma \geq 0 = f(\gamma)$ and (2.3) is again true for this subcase. Moreover, for $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_a^+ \subset \mathbb{R}_+^3$, by Theorem 1.1, we recall that the inequality

$$c^{rc} + b^{rb} > b^{rc} + c^{rb}, \tag{2.4}$$

holds true for all $r \in [0, e]$. Adding (2.3) and (2.4) we deduce (1.2).

The proof for $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_b^+ \cup \mathbb{E}_c^+$ is similar to the case $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_a^+$ and we omit the details. However, we comment that for $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_b^+$ we choose $t = b^{rc}, \gamma = c^{2c}$ and $s = b/c$ and for $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_c^+$ we select $t = c^{ra}, \gamma = b^{ra}$ and $s = c/a$.

(c_3) **Case** $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_a^- \cup \mathbb{E}_b^- \cup \mathbb{E}_c^-$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_a^-$ is such that $c < b < a$, since the proof for $b < c < a$ is similar. We note that $\Omega = [0, e] \times [0, 1]$ can be partitioned in the two sets

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \Big\{(r,c) \in \Omega \quad : \quad c \in [(r-1)r^{-1}, 1]\Big\} \quad \text{and} \\ \Omega_2 &= \Big\{(r,c) \in \Omega \quad : \quad c \in [0, (r-1)r^{-1}]\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we continue the proof by distinguish the following two subcases: $(r,c) \in \Omega_1$ and $(r,c) \in \Omega_2$.

For the subcase $(r,c) \in \Omega_1$, we apply the function f given on Proposition 2.1 with $t = b^{rc}$, $\gamma = c^{rc}$ and $s = a/c$ to prove

$$b^{ra} + c^{rc} > b^{rc} + c^{ra} \quad \text{for } 0 < c < b < a < 1 \text{ and } (r,c) \in \Omega_1. \tag{2.5}$$

Indeed, we firstly note that the function $m : [c, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows $m(z) = zc^{rz} - c^{rc+1}$ has the following properties:

(m_a) $m(c) = 0$;

(m_b) $m(1) = c^r(1 - c^{rc+1-r}) \geq 0$ for all $(r,c) \in \Omega_1$ since $c > (r-1)/r$; and

(m_c) m has a maximum at $z_{\max} = -1/r \ln c$, since the first and second derivatives of m are given by $m'(z) = c^{rz}(1 + rz \ln c)$ and $m''(z) = c^{rz}(2r + rz \ln c) \ln c$ and naturally $m'(z_{\max}) = 0$ and $m''(z_{\max}) < 0$.

Moreover, we notice that $z_{\max} \geq c$ is equivalently to $1 > -rc \ln c$, which is true for $r \in [0, e]$ and $c \in [0, 1]$, see the proof of (2.1). Then, by (m_a)-(m_c), we follow that $m(z) \geq 0$, for all $z \in [c, 1]$. In particular, for $z = a$, we have that

$$ac^{ra} > c^{rc+1}, \quad \text{for } a \in [c, 1] \subset [0, 1] \text{ and } r \in [0, e]. \tag{2.6}$$

Now, from (2.6), we note that

$$\begin{aligned} ac^{ra} > c^{rc+1} \quad &\Rightarrow \quad c^{r(a-c)} > \frac{c}{a} \quad \Rightarrow \quad rc \ln c > \frac{c \ln(c/a)}{a-c} \\ &\Rightarrow \quad c^{rc} > e^{\frac{-c \ln(a/c)}{a-c}} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \gamma > g(s), \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

which implies (2.5) by application of Proposition 2.1-(ii), since $t > \gamma > g(s)$ and f is increasing on $]g(s), \infty[$.

For the subcase $(r,c) \in \Omega_2$, we apply the function f given on Proposition 2.1 with $t = b^{rc}$, $\gamma = c^{rc}$ and $s = a/c$ to prove

$$b^{ra} + c^{rc} > b^{rc} + c^{ra} \quad \text{for } 0 < c < b < a < 1 \text{ and } (r,c) \in \Omega_2. \tag{2.8}$$

We note that the inequality $c^{rc} > c^{r-1}$ holds true for all $(r,c) \in \Omega_2$. Now, in order to deduce that $\gamma > g(s)$ is suficiently to prove that $c^{r-1} > g(s)$. Indeed, the function $q : [c,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows $q(z) = c^{(1-r)z} z^c - c^{c+c(1-r)}$ has the following properties:
(q_a) $q(c) = 0$;
(q_b) $q(1) = c^{1-r}(1 - c^{c+(c-1)(1-r)}) \geq 0$ for all $(r,c) \in \Omega_2$, since $c \in [0,(r-1)/r]$; and
(q_c) q is increasing in $[c,1]$.
Then, we deduce that $q(z) \geq 0$ for all $z \in [c,1]$. In particular, for $z = a \in [c,1]$, we deduce that $c^{(1-r)a}a^c - c^{c+c(1-r)} \geq 0$, which implies the following sequence of implications

$$c^{(1-r)a}a^c > c^{c+c(1-r)} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{c^{(1-r)a}}{c^{c(1-r)}} > \frac{c^c}{a^c} \quad \Rightarrow \quad c^{1-r} > g(s).$$

Thus (2.8) holds true.

From (2.5) and (2.8), we deduce that

$$b^{ra} + c^{rc} > b^{rc} + c^{ra} \quad \text{for } 0 < c < b < a < 1 \text{ and } r \in [0,e]. \tag{2.9}$$

Hence, to complete the proof for $0 < c < b < a < 1$, we add the inequality (2.9) with $a^{ra} + b^{rb} > a^{rb} + b^{ra}$ for $r \in [0,e]$, which is true by Theorem 1.1.

For $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_b^- \cup \mathbb{E}_c^-$ we can follow line by line the proof of $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_a^-$. However, we can obtain a direct proof by apply the result obtained for $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_a^-$ by interchanging the role of variables. For instance, if $(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{E}_b^-$ then $(b,a,c) \in \mathbb{E}_a^-$ which implies (1.2).

Hence, by (a_3), (b_3) and (c_3) we follow the complet proof of Theorem 1.2.

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.3.** Given $b \in]0,1]$, we define the function $H :]0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows

$$H(x) = 2\sqrt{x^{rx}b^{rb}} - b^{rx} - x^{rb}.$$

Then we prove that $H(x) > 0$ for all $x \in]0,1]$, which naturally implies the inequality $2\sqrt{a^{ra}b^{rb}} \geq a^{rb} + b^{ra}$ for $x = a$. Indeed, we prove that the function H has a global minimum at $x = b$. The fact that in $x = b$ there is a local minimum of H, follows by noticing that $H'(b) = 0$ and $H''(b) > 0$, since

$$\begin{aligned} H'(x) &= r\left[\sqrt{x^{rx}b^{rb}}\Big(\ln x + 1\Big) - b^{rx}\ln b - bx^{rb-1}\right] \quad \text{and} \\ H''(x) &= r\left[\sqrt{x^{rx}b^{rb}}\left\{r\Big(\ln x + 1\Big)^2 + x^{-1}\right\} - rb^{rx}(\ln b)^2 - b(rb-1)x^{rb-2}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, the property that b is a global minimum of H can be proved by rewriting H' as the difference of two functions and by analyzing the sign of H' using some properties of this new functions. Indeed, to be more specific, we note that $H'(x) = r[K(x) - Q(x)]$ for all $x \in]0,1]$, where the functions K and Q are defined as follows

$$K(x) = \sqrt{x^{rx}b^{rb}}\Big(\ln x + 1\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad Q(x) = b^{rx}\ln b + bx^{rb-1}.$$

The functions K and Q have the following properties

(K_1) K is strictly increasing on $]0,1]$, since $K'(x) = \sqrt{x^{rx}b^{rb}}\left\{r\Big(\ln x + 1\Big)^2 + x^{-1}\right\} > 0$, for all $x \in]0,1]$.
(K_2) $K(x) \to -\infty$ when $x \to 0^+$, $K(1/e) = 0$ and $K(1) = \sqrt{b^{rb}}$.
(Q_1) The derivative of Q is given by $Q'(x) = rb^{rx}(\ln b)^2 + b(rb-1)x^{rb-2}$, for all $x \in]0,1]$. Then, in order to analize the sign of Q', we introduce the set $\Lambda =]0,1] \times]0,e]$ and a partition $\{\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3\}$ of Λ, where

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 &= \Big\{(b,r) \in \Lambda \ : \ Q'(x) > 0 \ \text{ for all } x \in]0,1]\Big\} \\ \Lambda_2 &= \Big\{(b,r) \in \Lambda \ : \ Q'(x) < 0 \ \text{ for all } x \in]0,1]\Big\} \\ \Lambda_3 &= \Big\{(b,r) \in \Lambda \ : \ \exists! c \in]0,1] \ \text{ such that } Q \text{ has a minimum at } x = c\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that the sets Λ_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, are not empty since for instance $]0, 1[\times[1/b, e] \subset \Lambda_1$ for all $b \in]0, 1]$, $\{1\}\times]0, 1[\subset \Lambda_2$ and $]0, 1[\times\{1\} \subset \Lambda_3$. Moreover, we note that $rb > 1$ implies that $(b, r) \in \Lambda_1$ and naturally $\Lambda_2 \cup \Lambda_3$ is a subset of $]0, 1]\times]0, 1/b[$. The uniqueness of c can be deduced by noticing that the solution of $Q'(x) = 0$ is equivalent to the intersection of the following two monotone functions $S(x) = rb^{rx}(\ln b)^2$ and $J(x) = b(1 - rb)x^{rb-2}$.

(Q_2) $Q(x) \to \ln b$ when $x \to 0^+$, and $Q(1) = b^r \ln b + b$.

From (K_1) and (Q_1) we deduce the uniqueness of $b \in]0, 1]$ such that $Q(b) = K(b)$ or equivalently $H'(b) = 0$. Now, from (K_2) and (Q_2), we note that $Q(0^+) > K(0^+)$ for all $(r, b) \in \Lambda$ since $K(0^+) = -\infty$. Then, $H'(x) < 0$ for all $x \in]0, b[$. Additionally, from (K_2) and (Q_2), we observe that $Q(1) < K(1)$. This fact is a consequence of that the function $F(w, r) = \sqrt{w^{rw}} - w^r \ln(w) - w$ is strictly decreasing in r, since $F_r(w, r) = \ln(w)\Big((r/2)\sqrt{w^{rw}} - w^r \ln(w)\Big) < 0$. Consequently, for $r < e$ we have that $F(w, r) > F(w, e) = \sqrt{w^{ew}} - w^e \ln(w) - w > 0$ for all $w \in]0, 1]$. Hence, for $w = b$ we get that $F(b, r) > 0$ or $Q(1) < K(1)$, which implies that $H'(x) > 0$ for all $x \in]b, 1]$. Thus, b is a global minimum of H. Therefore, $H(x) \geq H(b) = 0$ for all $x \in]0, 1]$ and in particular for $x = a$.

2.5. **Proof of Theorem 1.4.** The proof follows by the fact that the function $P :]0, 1]^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined the following correspondence rule

$$P(z_1, \ldots, z_{n-1}) = nx_n^{x_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} z_i^{z_i} - \left(x_n \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} z_j\right)^{x_n} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(x_n \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} z_j\right)^{x_i}, \quad x_n \in]0, 1],$$

has a global minimum at $(z_1, \ldots, z_{n-1}) = (x_n, \ldots, x_n)$. Indeed, by simplicity of notation we develop the details of the proof for $n = 3$ and with $(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (a, b, c)$. Note that, in this case for an arbitrary $c \in]0, 1]$, the function $P :]0, 1]^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ has the following form

$$P(x, y) = 3x^x y^y c^c - (xyc)^x - (xyc)^y - (xyc)^c.$$

Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
P_x(x, y) &= 3x^x y^y c^c\Big(\ln(x) + 1\Big) - \Big(\ln(xyc) + 1\Big)(xyc)^x - \frac{y}{x}(xyc)^y - \frac{c}{x}(xyc)^c,\\
P_y(x, y) &= 3x^x y^y c^c\Big(\ln(y) + 1\Big) - \frac{x}{y}(xyc)^x - \Big(\ln(xyc) + 1\Big)(xyc)^y - \frac{c}{y}(xyc)^c,\\
P_{xx}(x, y) &= 3x^x y^y c^c\left[\frac{1}{x} + \Big(\ln(x) + 1\Big)^2\right]\\
&\quad - \left[\frac{1}{x} + \Big(\ln(xyc) + 1\Big)^2\right](xyc)^x - \left[\frac{y^2 - y}{x^2}\right](xyc)^y - \left[\frac{c^2 - c}{x^2}\right](xyc)^c,\\
P_{yy}(x, y) &= 3x^x y^y c^c\left[\frac{1}{y} + \Big(\ln(y) + 1\Big)^2\right]\\
&\quad - \left[\frac{x^2 - x}{y^2}\right](xyc)^x - \left[\frac{1}{y} + \Big(\ln(xyc) + 1\Big)^2\right](xyc)^y - \left[\frac{c^2 - c}{y^2}\right](xyc)^c,\\
P_{xy}(x, y) &= P_{yx}(x, y) = 3x^x y^y c^c\Big(\ln(y) + 1\Big)\Big(\ln(x) + 1\Big)\\
&\quad - \left[\frac{x\Big(\ln(xyc) + 1\Big) + 1}{y}\right](xyc)^x - \left[\frac{y\Big(\ln(xyc) + 1\Big) + 1}{x}\right](xyc)^y - \left[\frac{c^2}{xy}\right](xyc)^c.
\end{aligned}$$

An evaluation at (c, c) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
P_x(c, c) &= P_y(c, c) = 0,\\
P_{xx}(c, c) &= P_{yy}(c, c) = c^{3c-1}\Big(-6c(\ln(c))^2 + 4\Big),\\
P_{xy}(c, c) &= P_{yx}(c, c) = c^{3c-1}\Big(3c(\ln(c))^2 - 2\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, defining $\mathbb{P}_1(w) = -6w(\ln(w))^2 + 4$ and $\mathbb{P}_2(w) = 27w^2(\ln w)^4 - 24w(\ln w)^2 + 4$, we observe that $P_{xx}(c,c) = c^{3c-1}\mathbb{P}_1(c)$ and $P_{xx}(c,c)P_{yy}(c,c) - P_{xy}(c,c)P_{xy}(c,c) = c^{2(3c-1)}\mathbb{P}_2(c)$. Then, the Hessian matrix asociated to P at (c,c) is positive semidefinite since both functions, $\mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{P}_2$, are positive on $]0,1]$ or equivalently the function P has a local minimum at (c,c). Now, we deduce that (c,c) is the global minimum since we can prove that (c,c) is the unique solution of $(P_x, P_y) = (0,0)$. Indeed, assuming that there is (x,y) with $x \neq y \neq c$ such that $P_x(x,y) = P_y(x,y) = 0$, we can deduce a contradiction. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Big|P_x(x,y) - P_y(x,y)\Big| \\ &\geq \left|\min\left\{3x^xy^yc^c, (xyc)^x, (xyc)^y, (xyc)^c\right\}\right|\left|\ln\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) - \frac{y}{x} - \frac{c}{x} + \frac{x}{y} + \frac{c}{y}\right| \\ &\geq \left|\min\left\{3x^xy^yc^c, (xyc)^x, (xyc)^y, (xyc)^c\right\}\right|\left|\frac{1}{x} + \frac{x+y}{xy} + \frac{c}{xy}\right|\Big|x-y\Big|, \end{aligned}$$

since the inequality $\ln(r) > (r-1)/r$ holds for all $r > 0$ and $r \neq 1$ (see for instance [27]). Then, $x = y$, which is a contradiction with the assumption that $x \neq y$. Thus, we have (c,c) is a global minimum of the function P or equivalently $P(x,y) \geq P(c,c) = 0$ for all $(x,y) \in]0,1]^2$, which implies the desired inequality for $(x,y) = (a,b)$.

3. Aditional remarks on posible generalizations

In this section we present the posible extensions of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 to a sequence of positive real numbers. We note that the natural generalizations of (1.2) and (1.3) are given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{rx_i} \geq x_n^{rx_1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{rx_{i+1}}, \quad (x_1,\ldots,x_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \quad r \in [0,e], \tag{3.1}$$

$$n\sqrt[n]{\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{rx_i}} \geq x_n^{rx_1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{rx_{i+1}}, \quad (x_1,\ldots,x_n) \in]0,1]^n, \tag{3.2}$$

respectively. We present a partial proof of (3.1) (see Lemma 3.1, below) and leaves as a conjecture the proof of (3.2).

Lemma 3.1. *The inequality given in the equation* (3.1) *holds for all* $r \in [0,e]$*, if we restrict* $(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ *to the hipercube* $[0,1]^n$*.*

Proof. Before, of the start the proof, we notice that the function $\Upsilon(x,y) = x^{a/b} - x - y^{a/b} + y$ defined from $\mathbb{R}_+^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ and for $a > b$ is concave and $\Upsilon(0,0) = \Upsilon(1,0) = \Upsilon(0,1) = \Upsilon(1,1) = 0$. Then $\Upsilon(x,y) \geq 0$ for all $(x,y) \in [0,1]\times[0,1]$. Similarly, the function $\Upsilon_s(w,z) = \Upsilon(z,w)$ for $a < b$ is concave and $\Upsilon_s(w,z) \geq 0$ for all $(w,z) \in [0,1]\times[0,1]$. Now, we proceed by induction on n. Let us assume that the theorem is valid for a sequence of positive numbers $(x_1,\ldots,x_k)$ for all $k < n$. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{rx_i} - x_n^{rx_1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{rx_{i+1}} \\ &\quad= \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{rx_i} - x_{n-1}^{rx_1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} x_i^{rx_{i+1}}\right] + \left[x_n^{rx_n} + x_{n-1}^{rx_{n-1}} - x_n^{rx_{n-1}} - x_{n-1}^{rx_n}\right] \\ &\qquad + \left[x_n^{rx_{n-1}} - x_n^{rx_1} - x_{n-1}^{rx_{n-1}} + x_{n-1}^{rx_1}\right] \\ &\quad:= \mathbb{K}_1 + \mathbb{K}_2 + \mathbb{K}_3. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

The terms $\mathbb{K}_1$ and $\mathbb{K}_2$ are positive by the inductive hypothesis. Meanwhile, the term $\mathbb{K}_3$ is positive by the coancavity of the functions Υ and Υ_s. Note that $a = x_{n-1}$ and $b = x_n$ and

$\mathbb{K}_3 = \Upsilon(x_n^{rx_1}, x_{n-1}^{rx_1})$ or $\mathbb{K}_3 = \Upsilon_s(x_{n-1}^{rx_1}, x_n^{rx_1})$, depending if $x_{n-1} > x_1$ or $x_{n-1} < x_1$, respectively. Then, by (3.3) we follow that the Lemma is valid. □

Conjeture 3.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n > 4$. Then, the inequality* (3.1) *holds for all $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $r \in [0, e]$.*

Conjeture 3.2. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq 3$. Then, the inequality* (3.2) *holds for all $r \in [0, e]$.*

Conjeture 3.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_i \in]0, 1]^n$. Then, the inequality*

$$n \prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{rx_i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big(\prod_{j=1}^{n} x_j \Big)^{rx_i}$$

holds for all $r \in [0, e]$.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the support of "Univesidad del Bío-Bío" (Chile) through the research projects 124109 3/R, 104709 01 F/E and 121909 GI/C.

References

[1] Dahmani, A., Karima Belaide, K: Exponential inequalities in calibration problems with gaussians errors. Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods. **42**(19), 3596–3607 (2013).
[2] Hou, Q., Lin, Z., Dusing, R. W., Gajewski, B. J., Mccallum, R. W: A bayesian hierarchical assessment of gastric emptying with the linear, power exponential and modified power exponential models. Neurogastroenterology & Motility, **22**(12), 1308–1317 (2010)
[3] Floyd, B. N. I. Camilleri, M., Andresen, V., Esfandyari, T., Busciglio, I., Zinsmeister, A. R: Comparison of mathematical methods for calculating colonic compliance in humans: power exponential, computer-based and manual linear interpolation models. Neurogastroenterology & Motility, **20**(4), 330–335 (2008)
[4] Park, J.-S, Baek, J: Efficient computation of maximum likelihood estimators in a spatial linear model with power exponential covariogram. Computers & Geosciences, **27**(1), 1–7 (2001)
[5] Bruno, A. D: Power-exponential expansions of solutions to an ordinary differential equation. Doklady Mathematics, **85**(3), 336–340 (2012)
[6] Fan, X., Grama, I., Liu, Q: Large deviation exponential inequalities for supermartingales. Electron. Commun. Probab. **17**(59), 1–8 (2012)
[7] Miyagi, M., and Nishizawa, Y: A short proof of an open inequality with power-exponential functions. Aust. J. Math. Anal. Appl., **11**(1), Art. 6, 3 (2014)
[8] Miyagi, M., and Nishizawa, Y: Proof of an open inequality with double power-exponential functions. Journal of Inequalities and Applications. **2013** (1), 468 (2013)
[9] Yin-Li: Solutions of two conjectures on inequalities with power-exponential functions. RGMIA-Research Report. **12**(4), Art. 7 (2009)
[10] Hisasue, M. . Solution of inequalities with power-exponential functions by cîrtoaje. Australian Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, **9**(2), 1–4 (2012)
[11] Cîrtoaje, V: Proofs of three open inequalities with power-exponential functions. The Journal of Nonlinear Science and Applications, **4**(2):130–137 (2011)
[12] Cîrtoaje, V: On some inequalities with power-exponential functions. J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math. **10**(1), Article 21 (2009)
[13] Coronel, A., Huancas, F: On the inequality $a^{2a} + b^{2b} + c^{2c} \geq a^{2b} + b^{2c} + c^{2a}$. Aust. J. Math. Anal. Appl., **9**(1), Article 3 (2012)
[14] Manyama, S: Solution of one conjecture on inequalities with power-exponential functions. Aust. J. Math. Anal. Appl., **7**(2), Article 1 (2010)
[15] Matejíčka, L: On an open problem posed in the paper "Inequalities of power-exponential functions". J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math. **9**(3), Article 75 (2008)
[16] Qi, F., Debnath, L: Inequalities for power-exponential functions. J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math. **1**(2), Article 15 (2000)
[17] Qi, F., Xu, S.-L: The function $(b^x - a^x)/x$: inequalities and properties. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **126**(11), 3355–3359 (1998)
[18] Cerone, P., Dragomir, S. S: Mathematical Inequalities, CRC Press Boca Raton, (2011)
[19] Wright, E. M: Solution of the equation $ze^z = a$. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A. **65**, 193–203 (1959).
[20] Wright, E. M: Solution of the equation $ze^z = a$. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **65**, 89–93 (1959)
[21] Wright, E. M: Solution of the equation $(pz + q)e^z = rz + s$. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **66**, 277–281 (1960)
[22] Lambert, J. H: Observations variae in mathesin puram. Acta Helvitica, physico-mathematico-anatomico-botanico-medica, **63**, 128–168 (1758)

[23] Euler, J: De serie lambertina plurimisque eius insignibus proprietatibus. Acta Acad. Scient. Petropol. **2**, 29–51 (1783)
[24] Pólya, G., Szegő, G: Aufgaben und Lehrsätze aus der Analysis. Band II: Funktionentheorie, Nullstellen, Polynome Determinanten, Zahlentheorie. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, (1971)
[25] Corless, R. M, Gonnet, G. H, Hare, D. E. G, Jeffrey, D. J, Knuth, D. E: On the Lambert W function. Adv. Comput. Math. **5**(4), 329–359 (1996)
[26] Hoorfar, A, Hassani, M: Inequalities on the Lambert W function and hyperpower function. J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math. **9**(2), Article 51 (2008)
[27] Bullen, P. S: A Dictionary of Inequalities, Volume 97 of Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics. Longman, Harlow (1998)
[28] Luo, J, Wen, J. J: A power-mean discriminance of comparing a^b and b^a. In Research Inequalities, Edited by Xue-Zhi Yand, People's Press of Tibet, The People's Republic of China, pages 83–88 (2000)
[29] Cîrtoaje, V: Proofs of three open inequalities with power-exponential functions. J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl. **4**(2), 130–137 (2011)
[30] zeikii, A, Cîrtoaje V, Berndt, B: Mathlinks Forum, http://www.mathlinks.ro/Forum/viewtopic.php?t=118722, Nov. 2006, (2006)
[31] Matejíčka, L. Solution of one conjecture on inequalities with power-exponential functions. J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math. **10**(3), 1–5 (2009)
[32] Nelsen, R. B: Napier's inequality (two proofs). College Math. Journal, **24**(2), 165 (1993)